important element in the term **by faith**.  
But it would not be safe here to insist on  
either of these), **by means of which** (viz.  
*which faith*, not, which *sacrifice*: **by which**  
must apply to the same as **by it** below,  
and that surely can refer to nothing but  
the *faith*, which is the great leading idea  
of the chapter) **he was testified** (see above,  
ver. 2) **to be righteous** (when? by whom?  
not, by our Saviour, nor by St. John  
[1 John iii. 12), though in both places  
such testimony is borne to him: but as  
explained in the next clause, at the time  
of his sacrifice, and by God Himself), **God  
bearing testimony upon** (in regard to)  
**his gifts** (of what kind this testimony was,  
there can be little doubt. Theodotion’s  
rendering of the text in Genesis, “*and  
God consumed them by fire,*” though  
wrong as a rendering, is probably right  
in fact. Compare Exod. xiv. 24; 1 Kings  
xviii. 24, 28): **and by means of it** (his  
faith, again, not, his sacrifice: see above)  
**having died he yet speaketh** (viz., as  
interpreted by the parallel place, ch. xii.  
24, where it is said of the “*blood of  
sprinkling,” that it speaketh better things  
than Abel*,—by means of his blood, of  
which it is said by God in Gen. iv. 10,  
“The voice of thy brother’s blood crieth  
to me from the ground.” Some have taken  
it in the sense of speaks to us to follow  
his example? And perhaps Stuart may  
be partly right, who recognizing the allusion   
to Gen. iv. 10, says, “The form of  
expression only in our verse seems to be  
borrowed from Gen. iv. 10, for here it is  
the *faith* of Abel which makes him speak  
after his death; viz. to those who should  
come after him, exhorting and encouraging  
them to follow his example.” I say *partly*  
right, for however this may be in the  
background the cry of his blood is obviously   
primary in the Writer’s thought,  
from ch. xii. 24, where the voice of Abel is  
contrasted with that of the Christian blood  
of sprinkling).

**5, 6**] *The example of Enoch: and  
axiomatic declaration upon it.* {5} **By faith**  
(“how was he translated by faith? Because   
his well-pleasing to God was the  
ground of his translation, and faith was  
the ground of this well-pleasing.” Chrysostom)   
**Enoch was translated not to see  
death** (see the Septuagint version of Gen.  
v. 24, after which this verse is framed:  
“And Enoch pleased God, and was not  
found, because God translated him.”  
**was translated**, by a sudden disappearance  
from this earth. This translation was  
hardly, as Calvin thinks, “some extraordinary   
death,” though he means this  
in no rationalistic sense, as is plain from  
his accompanying remarks:—but rather  
1a change which passed upon him altogether  
without death, from corruptibility to incorruptibility,   
from the natural body to  
the spiritual); **and was not found** (see  
above), **because God translated him: for  
before his translation a testimony is  
given to him** (the expression implies the  
continued existence of the testimony in tho  
text of Scripture), **that he hath** (had)  
**pleased God. {6} But apart from faith it is  
impossible** (it is general axiom, not a  
mere assertion regarding Enoch; it it were,  
we should expect *it was impossible for him*)  
**to please** (Him, as is evident) **at all** (to  
do a single act well pleasing to God): **for  
it behoves him that cometh to God** (that  
approach which is elsewhere designated *by  
drawing near to God*, ch. vii. 19,—for the  
purposes of worship or of communion, or  
of trust, or service generally) **to believe**  
(literally, **to have believed**, because it  
is not here the state in which the comer